



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We cannot conceal from your honourable house our apprehensions, that the prayer of this our petition will not be attended to until it be too late; but your petitioners will, in any event, have the satisfaction arising from a conscientious discharge of the duty they owe their country. Your petitioners most earnestly request, that your honourable house will, at an early day, cause inquiry to be made into the present defective state of the representation, and adopt such other means as shall prevent the choice of representatives from being "committed to select bodies of men, of such limited numbers as render them an easy prey to the artful, or a ready purchase to the wealthy;" and to shorten the duration of parliaments; and by removing the causes of that confusion, litigation, and expense, with which they are at this day conducted, to render frequent and new elections, what our ancestors at the revolution asserted them to be, the means of a happy union and good agreement between the king and the people.

COMMON HALL.

Yesterday there was a very numerous meeting at Guildhall, to receive the report of the Sheriffs, with regard to their proceedings to procure an audience of the King, for the purpose of laying before his Majesty the resolutions of the last Common Hall.

According to the statement of the Sheriffs, it appeared that they had some interviews with the Secretary of State, in which they applied for an audience of his Majesty, in compliance with the directions, of the Livery, but they found their applications unavailing. They left a letter with the Secretary of State expressive of the objects of their applications, and to this, the answer was, that it had been laid before his Majesty, who declined to grant the audience required, because he had for the last four years in consequence of the state of his sight, declined to receive any addresses and petitions at the levee, and he did not feel it right to make any distinction.

After Aldermen Wood and Atkins had made this communication, which was received with strong expressions of discontent,

Mr. Favell stood forward, and in moving certain resolutions as expressive of the opinion of the meeting upon this report, called to their recollection the marked censure of the great Lord Chat-ham, upon the minister of his day, for returning an unfavourable answer to an address from the city of London. But how much more censurable was the con-

duct of that Minister, who absolutely refused even to receive the address of that city. (*Shouts of hear! hear!*)

Mr. Jones seconded the resolutions.

After the first resolution had been carried, and the second was put—

Mr. Sheriff Atkins presented himself to the Hall, and in a very elaborate speech endeavoured to shew that the Livery never possessed the right of presenting any address or petition to his Majesty upon the throne. The worthy Sheriff had gone on for some time in this strain, with occasional interruptions, but at length there was a general burst of indignation, which rendered it expedient for him to retire.

Mr. Waithman then appeared, and was received with acclamations of applause. He pointed out the mistake under which the honourable Alderman had been arguing throughout. For that Honourable Gentleman had confounded the right of the corporation to present any address or petition to his Majesty upon the throne, with that claimed by the Livery on this occasion, to present their address or remonstrance at the Levee. But the refusal to allow the Sheriffs of London a personal audience of his Majesty on this occasion, was really calculated to excite both astonishment and indignation; for such a refusal had never been attempted before, up to this particular instance. It would be recollected that when his Majesty first declined, in 1795, to receive the petitions of the Livery on the throne, it was prescribed to present such petitions at the Levee, and to that prescription it was now proposed to conform. But Ministers would not allow of even that conformity. They required that the whole thing should be vested in their discretion—either to throw the address or resolutions in the fire, or to communicate them to his Majesty. But the Livery shewed a disposition even to concede, in some degree, to Ministers. At the last Common Hall the right was waved to present a petition to his Majesty at the Levee, and it was proposed merely to require a personal audience. For the first time, this was denied—for the first time since the revolution this denial took place. Nay, the sentiment that prevailed even previous to the revolution, when attempts were made to seize our Charter, shewed how tenacious our ancestors were of every thing connected with the right of petitioning. In order to illustrate that sentiment, the Worthy Member read the following extract from the speech

of Sir George Treby, Recorder of London, upon an interesting argument with regard to the question of petitioning.

"That the Constitution and Law of the Land had given to the subject the right of petitioning and of access to the Supreme Governor, to represent to him their grievances, and to pray a redress of them; and, that the same Law gave them also a right to state in their petitions those facts and reasons which caused their grievances, provided those facts are true.

The facts recited in the petitions were unquestionably true, and even confessed by the king's council—the city admitted the king's power to prorogue parliament, and did in no sort question it. They only insisted, that it was as true, that all their grievances and dangers did proceed from that lawful, but unseasonable, act of the king's, and as there was one part of the constitution that gave the king power to prorogue the parliament, so there was another part of the constitution that gave the subject an original right to petition for redress of grievances; and that, therefore, to punish a man for showing in his petition those grievances which he desires to be redressed, and the causes of them, was the same thing as to deny him the right of petitioning, and that such a denial would infer oppression and the most abject slavery; for, when the subjects are misused and grieved, and are denied the liberty to complain and pray the king to redress those evils, where are they constitutionally to look for relief?"

The honourable gentleman animadverted at some length, and with considerable spirit, upon the endeavours of the present administration to injure the right so justly estimated by the high authority he had quoted. But these endeavours formed a part of the systematic attack which was making on the whole constitution of the country. According to that constitution—according to the act of settlement—it was provided that no placemen or pensioners should sit in the house of commons, and yet that house was now nearly filled by placemen and pensioners, or those who were so by proxy. By the same act, no foreigner was to hold any place of profit or power, either civil or military, in this country; but that provision was totally discarded, and we had now no less than 30,000 foreign troops quartered upon us. And in addition to these outrages, it seemed the resolution to deny us the right of petitioning.

Adverting to the allusions which he had made in that hall with regard to lord Castlereagh, the honourable member stated, that he had, since his last explanation, found, that before he had been applied to by the noble lord's friends to make that explanation, legal opinions had been consulted for ten or twelve days, whether an action could not be maintained against him, for what he had said in that hall—(*a general shout of indignation*)—This of course he did not know when he was addressed by lord Castlereagh's friend. But the consultation with lawyers to punish being found unavailing, it was thought expedient to conciliate. When the noble lord could not gratify his disposition, by seeking the former, he bent to his policy in attending to the latter. As it was not deemed expedient to prosecute him, (Mr. W.) for a libel, an appeal was made to his candour and justice on the part of the noble lord's friend. To this appeal he attended and gave all the explanation which candour and justice could require. With that explanation the parties who appealed expressed themselves perfectly satisfied; and yet he had been since most basely misrepresented. It had been said that he had retracted, but this he denied, for he had nothing to retract. What he had stated was, that lord Castlereagh's family received £36,000 a year from the public purse; and he objected to the opposite statements made to him by the noble lord's friend; because he observed that £9,000 a year was omitted, which had only been relinquished by the noble lord, and his connections, about a month or two before; and he also objected to the deduction of the sums paid to clerks or deputies, the whole coming out of the public purse. But what struck him most particularly was, that the noble lord's friend professed not to know that certain persons, enjoying considerable sinecures, were related to the noble lord, until he (Mr. W.) told him so. (*a general laugh*) When he mentioned that lord Camden received £30,000 a year, which made the aggregate sum derived from the public by lord Castlereagh's relations £66,000 instead of £36,000, as he had before mentioned, the noble lord's friend expressed surprise. "Nay more," observed Mr. Waithman, "the noble lord's friend, in alluding to the amount of lord Camden's sinecure, stated that he could not reconcile it to his conscience, nor did he conceive how any honest man could take so much money out of

the pockets of the public, without doing any thing for it, adding, that he was certain, lord Castlereagh did not differ from him upon the subject of that sinecure." In conclusion, the Hon. gentleman said, that he thought it his duty minutely to state these facts, because the public were interested in them, and because it was right to make known the tricks and juggles to which these men resorted, who would sacrifice kindred, friendship and candour, to serve their own ends.

A gentleman, whose name we could not learn, proposed the appointment of a committee of twenty members to watch over the rights of the city of London, and to devise the means of guarding against their violation.

But upon Mr. Waithman recommending the propriety of further deliberating about such a measure before it was put to the vote, the honourable gentleman was induced to wave his proposition.

The several resolutions were then put and carried unanimously.

At a meeting of the general committee of the Catholics of Ireland, held at the committee room, No. 4, Crow-street, on the 31st Jan. 1810.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE, BART. IN THE CHAIR,

Resolved, That, solemnly protesting against the unrelenting system of intolerance which the Catholics of Ireland appear to be doomed in this enlightened age to endure, we are yet stedfastly determined to persevere in claiming our emancipation.

And by our constancy in this just pursuit, and by availing ourselves of all warrantable means for this purpose, to prove ourselves worthy of those equal rights and liberties which we demand, and can never consent to forego.

Resolved, That, not dismayed by past disappointments, or deterred by existing difficulties, we shall take every occasion to utter our complaints, to solicit ample discussion, and to render our degraded and oppressed condition universally known—relying, that the unerring influence of justice and sound reason (to which we appeal) must speedily subdue those blind and fatal prejudices which obstruct the freedom and happiness of Ireland.

Resolved, That it is the indispensable duty of this committee to have their petition to parliament presented to both houses, so that the entire merits of our cause may be fairly and amply discussed.

Resolved, That the Earl of Fingall be requested forthwith to cause our petitions to both houses of parliament to be so proceeded upon as to ensure that inquiry and discussion which the honour and interest of the Catholic body imperiously require.

THOMAS ESMONDE, CHAIRMAN.

James Nangle, esq. in the chair.

Resolved, That the thanks of the meeting be given to Sir Thomas Esmonde, Bart. for his dignified and proper conduct in the chair.

EDWARD HAY, SEC.

PUBLIC OCCURRENCES.

BRITISH.

For the information of our readers we select from the Statesman, London Newspaper, the following article. The subject appears to have obtained but little attention in this country, although so clearly affecting a traffic which is so well known on the Change of Belfast.

BUYING OF BANK NOTES

The apprehension of Mr. De Yonge seems to have failed of producing the desired effect, for Bank Notes, in spite of every effort, continue to be bought at a reduced price. As the actual prosecu-

tion of Mr. De Yonge for the offence of buying Bank of England Notes, has by many been doubted, we have made some inquiry into the affair, and find that a bill of indictment has been found, on which Mr. De Yonge will be tried at the next Sessions. For the information of our Readers we present them with a copy of the first, and abstracts of the four last counts, of this curious document, in which it is averred, that the Notes of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, called Bank Notes, are of the